Yet they have been known to stay on strike for as long as six months.[1]

The workers were encouraged by the growth of radicalism within the Congress, and when the Congress took office last year they gladly welcomed it. There is no doubt that the Congress ministries have granted more facilities for agitation than existed previously, but the workers are by no means satisfied.

The Congress Election Manifesto stated that "in regard to

[1] Mr. Shiva Rao in *India Analysed,* speaks very feelingly of the difficulties of unionism. Despite the Acts, the Government frequently "watch developments'* and content themselves with sending for police reserves. They have often helped the employer by arresting, harassing or imprisoning the "ringleaders" and "agitators." An organiser is a "fomenter of mischief.'[3] An employer professes himself in sympathy with legal unions so long as there is no outsider on the executive, though the Law permits it. An executive with workers only on it is soon broken, for the organisers find themselves out of work, though the reasons given may be plausible. The difficulties have been immense. "We hold our public meetings of the workers . . . after dark so as to make the task of identification as difficult as possible for the agents of the employer. The only light is the dim lantern of the police reporter, without whom no workers' meeting in India takes place. Every word … is reported to the higher authorities, . . . The police also may be present . . . and the police superintendent . . « discusses with (the manager) the rights and wrongs of the strike. 'Before sp-and-sp came and talked to my men, there was never any trouble; life is just impossible now.' . . . It is terrible and nerve-racking to see a strike or lock-out through. . . . Attempted negotiations meet with the response: *I prefer to deal with my men direct and desire no outside assistance.' . . . If I am enjoying anyone's hospitality (usually a poor man who is anxious to do his bit for the workers), a hint is conveyed to him that, unless he gets rid of his guest, there will be trouble; and that is sufficient. . . For the first two weeks all is more or less well; but as the dispute goes on, with no sign of ending, anxiety begins to reveal itself on the face of the workers. At the end of four weeks privations become acute, but no one will dare to suggest a return to work. There are, of course, no relief funds worth the name, and employers' spies and police informers are everywhere. . . . It is impossible not to feel a profound respect for'such fine traits of character and to wonder why, if human nature be really frail, it does not break down under an intolerable sense of strain." Mr. Shiva Rao comes from the south, and the Madras Government was characterised by the R.C.L. as more reactionary than any they had come across in India.

It will be interesting to see what changes will take place in labour policy under the Congress Ministry in this province. It is worth re-emphasising that Mr. Shiva Rao is a moderate with little use for "Reds." The whole section of his chapter in *India Analysed* is worth reading, though Leftists will not care for it. He concludes by saying that Indian Nationalists will soon have a day of reckoning after the establishment of self-government in India, "unless they have ready for execution a far-reaching programme for the emancipation of the workers."